

Client/Matter: 071469-0306000

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-10 have been amended. Claims 11 and 12 are newly added. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-12 will be pending.

In the Office Action dated December 15, 2005, the Examiner required correction of the specification to include headers such as "Background of the Invention", "Description of the Related Art", and "Summary of the Invention". The Applicant notes the Examiner's request for correction of the specification. However, the Applicant did not include a description of the related art or a summary of the invention for this application. Accordingly, the Applicant does not believe that correction of the specification is warranted at this stage. The Applicant does not read the Office Action to require the addition of these sections. Accordingly, the omission of the headers noted by the Examiner is correct for the application as filed. Since these sections do not exist in this application, the Applicant does not believe that the addition of these headers is necessary. If, however, the Examiner would like these sections to be added, the Applicant stands willing to do so and will draft appropriate sections. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner clarify the statement regarding the specification. Specifically, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specify if these sections are to be drafted and added to the specification presented for examination.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Yamashita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,389,769). Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamashita et al. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with both rejections and, therefore, respectfully traverses the same.

Claims 1-12 are patentably distinguishable over the references cited by the Examiner because they recite a method of employing at least one identification tag to determine the presence or absence of a part or sub assembly of a semiconductor process tool (claims 1-5), a method of detecting the presence or absence of a plurality of identification tags responsive to radio frequency energy (claims 6 and 11), a method of identifying a part or assembly in a semiconductor processing tool with an identification tag responsive to radio frequency energy (claim 7), a method of identifying parts or assemblies in a semiconductor processing tool with identification tags responsive to radio frequency energy (claim 8), an assembly with an

Client/Matter: 071469-0306000

identification tag responsive to radio frequency energy (claim 9), and a semiconductor processing tool with identification tags responsive to radio frequency energy (claims 10 and 12), wherein, among other features, a dip in the radio frequency energy or the electromagnetic energy permits determination of the presence or absence of the identification tag or tags. Since none of the references describe or suggest any of the combinations now recited by the claims, the Applicant respectfully submits that the references cannot be relied upon to maintain a rejection of the claims.

In contrast to the present invention, Yamashita et al. describes an ID recognizing system in a semiconductor manufacturing system with card-shaped IC modules 30A and 30B that are buried in predetermined regions of the container 10 and the wafer cassette 15, respectively. (Yamashita et al. at col. 3, line 65, through col. 4, line 2.) A fixed station 20 transmits an induction radio wave. (Yamashita et al. at col. 4, line 14.) The ID modules 30A, 30B convert the energy of the received radio wave into DC power to drive the ID modules 30A, 30B. (Yamashita et al. at col. 4, lines 20-24.) The ID modules then transmit signals, such as the signal K₀₁ to the fixed station 20 through antennas, such as the antenna 31. (Yamashita et al. at col. 4, lines 32-47.) Accordingly, Yamashita et al. describes a system where the ID modules 30A, 30B transmit signals that are processed. At no place does Yamashita et al. describe or suggest that the ID modules 30A, 30B establish a dip in the radio frequency energy or the electromagnetic energy that permits determination of the presence or absence of the identification tag or tags. In fact, it may be said that the mere fact that the ID modules 30A, 30B transmit signals in and of itself teaches away from the combinations now recited by claims 1-12. At least for these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that Yamashita et al. may not be relied upon to reject any of claims 1-12. Simply, Yamashita et al. neither anticipates nor renders obvious any of claims 1-12.

Each of the rejections having been addressed, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in a condition for allowance and such is earnestly requested.

03-15-06

05:31pm From-PILLSBURY WINTHROP
ATTORNEYS - 10/012,083
Client/Matter: 071469-0306000

703-770-7901

T-614 P.008/008 F-524

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN
LLP


JEFFREY D. KARCESKI

Reg. No. 35914

Tel. No. 703 770.7510

Fax No.

Date: March 15, 2006
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900